



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,297	11/03/2000	Theron Tock	DANAP003	6720
22434	7590	09/17/2004	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			QURESHI, SHABANA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,297

Applicant(s)

TOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Shabana Qureshi

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment filed on 7/1/2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Barrett et al reference.

Applicant argues that Barrett does not disclose or suggest that the modifying is performed within the script portion of a document to link to an intermediary server.

Applicant also argues that Barrett does not disclose how links are modified i.e. scanning or searching the document to modify the URLs.

Applicant further argues that Barrett does not suggest replacing a predetermined function or property statement with a set or get cookies function call.

As per Applicant's argument that Barrett does not disclose or suggest that the modifying is performed within a script portion of a document to link to an intermediary server, Examiner directs Applicant to Table 1, which states that the action of the document editor is to modify documents, which can be applets. Therefore, Barrett does teach that scripts are modified.

Examiner would like to further clarify that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that scripts are included in html documents, therefore modifications on HTML documents will resultingly modify scripts¹. Eich et al teach that scripts are included in HMTL documents and include URLs (Eich et al., page 210).

As per Applicant's argument that Barrett does not disclose how links are modified, although the steps of scanning and searching are not explicitly stated by Barrett et al., official

¹ Eich, Brendan et al., Netscape Navigator, Netscape Navigation Corporation, 1996, Mountainview, CA, pages 24, 210.

Art Unit: 2155

notice is taken that it is old and well known in the networking art that in order to redirect a document it is advantageous and common practice to scan and search for the URL that is to be replaced.

As per Applicant's argument that Barrett does not suggest replacing a predetermined function or property statement with a set or get cookies function call, Examiner asserts that cookies are replaced in the HTML document (section 3.3.1). Function and property statements are common to scripts (Eich et al., page 210) and therefore, official notice is taken that it is common and well known in the networking art that in order to replace a cookie, predetermined function or property of the original request must be modified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al.².

As per claims 1, 10, 16, 17, 20, and 21, Barrett et al teach a method for modifying a markup language document comprising:

- receiving the markup language document at an intermediary server, the markup language document having at least a script portion including at least one link to a resource (page

² Barrett et al, "Intermediaries: new places for producing and manipulating Web content", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, North Holland Publishing. Amsterdam, NL, vol. 30, no. 1-7, 01 April 1998, pages 509-518.

Art Unit: 2155

510, column 1, lines 22-45; page 512, column 1, lines 42-44; Figure 1; Figure 5B, Table 1);

- locating hostnames of Universal Resource Locators (URLs) constructed or to be constructed within the script portion of the particular HTML document (figure 3 and associated description; Table 1); and
- modifying the at least one link within the script portion of the markup language document to link to the intermediary server (page 510, column 1, lines 22-45; page 512, column 1, lines 42-44; Figure 1; Figure 5B, Table 1, see explanation above).

Barrett et al do not explicitly state that hostnames of URLs are located within the document. However, the “Request Editor” described by Barrett et al in Table 1 “redirects the request to a new URL”. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the networking art that a hostname must be located within the web document in order to redirect the URLs to the intermediary server.

As per claims 2 and 22, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 20, wherein the markup language document is being requested by a client, the method being performed further comprising:

- delivering the markup language document to the client after the modifying (page 510, column 1, lines 22-45; page 512, column 1, lines 42-44; Figure 1; Figure 5B, Table 1).

As per claims 3, 12, and 23, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 1, 10, and 20, wherein the markup language document is a HTML document (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30; page 514, column 1, lines 1-5).

As per claims 4, 11, 24, and 30, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 1, 10, 20, and 21, wherein the modifying comprises:

- scanning the markup language document to locate the script portion (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30);
- searching the script portion to locate a hostname (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30);
- producing a replacement hostname for the located hostname (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30); and
- replacing the replacement hostname for the located hostname (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30, section 3.3.1).

Although the steps of scanning and searching are not explicitly stated by Barrett et al., official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the networking art that in order to redirect a document it is advantageous to scan and search for the URL that is to be replaced.

As per claims 5 and 25, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 4 and 24, wherein the located hostname is associated with the remote servers, and the replacement hostname is associated with the intermediary server (abstract).

As per claim 6 and 26, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 5 and 25, wherein the located hostname is part of the link (Table 1).

As per claims 7 and 27, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 6 and 26, wherein the link is a Universal to Resource Locator for the another resource (Table 1).

As per claims 8 and 28, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 5 and 25, wherein the markup language document is a HTML document (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30; page 514, column 1, lines 1-5).

As per claims 9 and 29, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 20, wherein the hostname is associated with the remote servers (Table 1).

As per claims 12 and 31, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 11 and 30, wherein the markup language document is a HTML document (page 512, column 1, lines 17-30; page 514, column 1, lines 1-5).

As per claims 13 and 32, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 11 and 30, wherein the predetermined function or to property statement pertains to setting or getting a cookie (page 513, columns 1 and 2, section 3.3.1). Examiner asserts that cookies are replaced in the HTML document (section 3.3.1). Function and property statements are common to scripts (Eich et al., page 210) and therefore, official notice is taken that it is common and well known in the networking art that in order to replace a cookie, predetermined function or property of the original request must be modified.

As per claims 14 and 33, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 11 and 30, wherein the predetermined function or property statement pertains to initiating a request (Table 1). Examiner asserts that as the packet being modified is a request, the statements within the packet pertain the initiation of the request.

As per claims 15 and 34, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claims 11 and 30, wherein the predetermined function or property statement that returns a Universal Resource Locator (Table 1). The logic of claim 13 applies to this limitation (see Eich et al, page 210).

As per claim 18, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claim 17, wherein the predetermined function or property statement pertains to setting or getting a cookie (page 513, columns 1 and 2, section 3.3.1). Examiner asserts that cookies are replaced in the HTML

Art Unit: 2155

document (section 3.3.1). Function and property statements are common to scripts (Eich et al., page 210) and therefore, official notice is taken that it is common and well known in the networking art that in order to replace a cookie, predetermined function or property of the original request must be modified.

As per claim 19, Barrett et al teach the method as recited in claim 17, wherein the predetermined function or property statement pertains to initiating a request (Table 1). Examiner asserts that as the packet being modified is a request, the statements within the packet pertain the initiation of the request.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Shabana Qureshi
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

September
12 ~~January~~ 2004


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER